



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/363,234	07/27/1999	DOUGLAS E. OTT	15006.0008	7886

7590

02/04/2004

D. EDWARD DOLGORUKOV
MARSHALL AND MELHORN, LLC
FOUR SEAGATE, EIGHTH FLOOR
TOLEDO, OH 43604

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MICHAEL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/363,234

Applicant(s)

OTT ET AL.

Examiner

Michael M. Thompson

Art Unit

3763

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the _____ application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.


Claim(s) rejected: 34,35,38,39,49-56,59,60,70-75 and 97-99.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 25-33,36,37,40-48,57,58,61-69,76-96 and 100.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. For purposes of clarity the rejection of record is an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. It is the Examiner's position that Applicant's intended use of the apparatus as claimed is not germane to the prior art rejection at hand. A recitation with respect to the manner in which an apparatus is intended to be employed does not impose any structural limitation upon the claimed apparatus which differentiates it from the prior art reference disclosing the structural limitations of the claim. In re Pearson, 494 F.2d 958, 177USPQ 7005 (CCPA 1973); In re Finsterwalder, 436 F.2d 1028, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971); In re Casey, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1963); Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (BdPatApp & Inter 1987). Furthermore, Danielle is not recited in the combination to "achieve the purpose of Applicant." The fact that Bartels in combination with Danielle teach a different strategy for humidification is irrelevant. The only relevance is whether the combination teaches the limitations Applicant's broadly claimed apparatus. The Examiner asserts that the claim limitations have been met wherein Bartels teaches a device for humidification and Danielle teaches a similar interest in increasing the humidity to maximum by alternatively using a humidity sensor. It should be noted that the reasons for utilizing humidified air of the lung cavity is similar to the reasons for using humidified air for the body cavities by maintaining humidity thereby providing moisture of the cavity. As the combination is recited Bartels may suffer from the deficiencies of knowing what the humidity is in the system and Danielle remedies the supposed deficiencies by indicating the use of a humidity sensor. It is obviously the intent of Danielle to provide and maintain a base level of humidity.




BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700